



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/582,852

06/14/2006

Keisuke Onishi

062665

6946

38834 7590 05/10/2010
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

OBAYANJU, OMONIYI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/10/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/582,852	Applicant(s) ONISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner OMONIYI A. OBAYANJU	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,8,10,11,13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,8,10,11,13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/19/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued with respect to the independent claims that the prior art reference (Takayama et al.) fails to teach or disclose “the content guide information”.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument. First, Applicant's argument is unclear **with respect to the claimed limitations. On pg. 1 of the remarks/argument** filed on 03/19/2010, Applicant merely presented a summary of the prior art reference (Takayama) and stated that “...Takayama's server does not provide a service list, which is similar to the content guide information of the present invention”.

Also, based on the understanding of the argument presented, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **the mobile station communicates with the server, requests to provide the service list with the mobile station and then Selects a desired service by referring to the service list.**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, as previously presented, **in pg. 2, pp0049-pp0050 and pp0040-pp0041**, Takayama teaches at least in part the claimed limitation **“a content guide information”**

Finally, Applicant’s argument with respect to the Secondary prior art reference (Chinomi et al.) is moot because Takayama teaches the at least claimed limitation. However, Chinomi cures other Takayama’s deficiencies as will be discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takayama et al. (US Publication No. 20010019960) in view of Chinomi et al. (US Publication No. 20040059498).

As to **claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13**, Takamaya teaches an information distribution system comprising: an information distribution server (service system, fig. 2, #11) and a mobile terminal (fig. 2), where the information distribution server (fig. 2, #11) is equipped with a content database that associates and memorizes content

downloadable (service program) to the mobile terminal, or content data indicating the registration location of such content, and area information indicating the specific area to which such content may be downloaded by the mobile terminal (fig. 2, #25, and pg. 2, pp0040, lines 1-3); and where the information distribution server is equipped with: a content guide information distribution means that transmits a content guide information (area decision based on service selection information) associating the content downloadable to the mobile terminal with the area to which such content may be downloaded to the mobile terminal (pg. 2, pp0049-50 lines 1-7 and pp0040-0041); a distribution request reception means that receives content distribution requests from the mobile terminal (fig. 2, #22, and pg. 3, pp0075-0077, receives service selection from mobile terminal); a position judgment means that determines the position of the mobile terminal (fig. 2, #23, and pg. 3, pp0079 lines 1-5); and a distribution enabled/disabled decision means that checks the position of the mobile terminal determined by the position judgment means against the area information associated with the content whose distribution is requested (pg. 3, pp0079 lines 1-5), and decides whether to distribute the content data in question (pg. 3, pp0080, lines 1-10); and where the mobile terminal is equipped with: a position information transmission means that sends information on the current position of the mobile terminal to the information distribution server; and a distribution request means that makes distribution requests to the information distribution server (pg. 3, pp0075, lines 1-7, mobile station sends service selection information) and selects content to be

downloaded according to the content guide information distributed by the information distribution server (pg. 2, pp0049-50 lines 1-7); and the system is configured in such manner that the mobile terminal acquires the content guide information associating the content corresponding to the selected item (area based on service selection information) with the area to which such content may be downloaded, from the information distribution server and, in case of acquiring a specific content on the content guide information (service according to different areas) (pg. 2, pp0056-pp0064), unless the specific content is a content that is distributed in an area including the current position, the distribution request means transmits the distribution request of the specific content along with the information on the current position to the information distribution server when the mobile terminal moves to an area where the specific content is distributed (providing to users in the vicinity, pg. 5, pp0102-pp0103, and pp0105), and that when the information distribution server receives the distribution request of the content being selected based on the content guide information (area decision based on service selection information) from the mobile terminal (pg. 2, pp0049-50 lines 1-7 and pp0040-0041), if the area information associated with the content whose distribution is requested matches the position of the mobile terminal, the information distribution server distributes the content data in question to the mobile terminal (pg. 2, pp0041, lines 1-8). However, Takamaya fails to teach a display unit that displays a menu list for selecting a desirable item from within plural items.

Art Unit: 2617

But, Chinomi teaches a display unit that displays a menu list for selecting a desirable item from within plural items (list of contents that can be downloaded based on location, pg. 3, pp0042, and pp0047-pp0048). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time invention was made to combine the teachings of Tamakaya and Chinomi to achieve the goal of efficiently, reliably, and accurately providing information to communication devices in a communication network.

As to **claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14**, Takamaya teaches wherein the position information transmission means comprises a current position detection means and a current position information transmission means that transmits current position information generated by the current position detection means (pg. 3, pp0071, pp0073, lines 1-8), and wherein the position judgment means (area decision device) determines the current position of the mobile terminal according to current position information received from the mobile terminal in question (pg. 2, pp0041, lines 1-5).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2617

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMONIYI A. OBAYANJU whose telephone number is (571)270-5885. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 7:30 - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent P. Harper can be reached on 571-272-7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. A. O./

/VINCENT P. HARPER/

Application/Control Number: 10/582,852

Page 8

Art Unit: 2617

Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2617